

VINDICATION
OF THE
CHURCH
OF
SCOTLAND.
BEING AN
ANSWER

To a PAPER, Intituled,

*Some Questions concerning Episcopal and Presbyterian
Government in SCOTLAND.*

WHEREIN

The Latter is Vindicated from the Arguments and Ca-
lumnies of that Author; and the former is made ap-
pear to be a Stranger in that NATION.

By a Minister of the Church of *Scotland*, as it is now
Established by Law.

The Second Edition.

EDINBURGH,

Printed by *George Mosman*, and are to be Sold at his Shop
in the *Parliament-Close*, Anno Dom. 1691.

VINDICATION
OF THE
RIGHTS
OF
SCOTLAND.
IN
ANSWER
TO A
PAMPHLET
PUBLISHED BY THE
SCOTISH PARLIAMENT
IN 1706.
BY
JAMES WILSON
OF
EDINBURGH.

Printed by J. Macmillan, Edinburgh.

W H E R E I N

It is shewn, that the
Rights of the
People of Scotland
are not only
inviolable, but
that they are
entitled to
the same
Protection
as the
Rights of
the People
of Great
Britain.

Printed by J. Macmillan, Edinburgh.

The Second Edition.

EDINBURGH:
Printed by George Thomson, and are to be sold at his Shop
in the Parliament-Close, Anno Domini 1791.

THE P R E F A C E.



That which is determined concerning all them that will live Godly in Christ Jesus, that they must suffer Persecution, is (and hath long been) the Lot of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland; and a Generation of Men have thus exercised her for many Years by Severities hardly parallell'd among Protestants: And now when their Hands are tied, that they can no more thus assist her, their Tongues and Pens are let loose to her without mercy, by the most virulent Invektives, and the most horrid Calumnies that their Wit can invent; there are more ways than one by which the Serpent casteth out of his mouth waters as a Flood, that the Roman may be carried away of it. We hoped in the little reviving that she hath given us from our Bondage; to have had no diversion from feeding the Flocks over which the Holy Ghost hath made us Overseers: But our Adversaries will force us unto a less pleasing Work, which is yet also necessary to the continuance of the Truth and Purity of the Gospel with the People of God. They are the Assailants, and we must all the part of Defendants; without which necessity I should not have troubled the Reader with the following sheets. It was judged necessary, not by me only, but by them whose Opinion and Authority I do justly reverence; in obedience to which, it was written four or six Months agoe, but was by several Accidents hitherto kept from coming forth to the Light. We are for Peace (even with them who have not suffered from us, but dealt hardly with us; and are willing to receive such of them as are qualified to be Ministers of the Gospel) but when we speak peace, who we are silent, and neither speak nor act against any of them but such the Gospel declares to be unfavoury Sali) they are for War; and labour to make us odious to Mankind, but especially to our Rulers.

Beside this Pamphlet, several other Prints have been emitted by these Men, containing partly Historical passages full of Lies and Reproaches, and partly false

The P R E F A C E.

and *spightful* representations of our Principles and way: To which an Answer such as they need or deserve, shall e're long be given, if the Lord permit. This hath not sooner been done, hath been in a great measure caused by the multitude of matters of Fact narrated in them, said to be done in divers places of the Nation, far remote one from another, to all which it was necessary to send for getting a true Account of these things, and there being but one Copy of each of the Books that we could find in all Scotland, the several passages for the divers parts of the Country behoved to be transcribed and dispersed, before Information about them could be had, which could not shun to require a long time; and when the Informations were obtained, some other things fell in, which did yet longer retard the Answer; which is now intended to be hastened as soon as may be. In this matter our Adversaries have used a piece of Cunning, which is, that these Books were spread in England only, where the things contained in them could not be known nor examined: But in Scotland (where most Readers could have discovered the falshood of their Allegations) there never was one of them to be found in a Bookseller's Shop: But veritas non quærit Angulos.

I shall not anticipate what is to be said in answer to the Books mentioned, as to a Letter of the same strain, very lately come from the Press; only it may be thought strange, that the Men with whom we have to do, should make such Tragical Outcries about their Sufferings, when it may be made appear that in the late Times when Presbyterians suffered from their hand, any one of many who may be instanced, suffered more Hardship and barbarous Cruelty, than all of them have endured. It is also unaccountable that they should on this occasion so reproach the Church as they do, while very few (not above a dozen, if I mistake not) have suffered by the Sentence of any Church Judicatory, and these for Scandals that no man will have the brow to plead for: And if two or three of them have been censured on slender grounds, as is alledged; not only our Church did give express warning to Presbyteries against this Practice: But the late General Assembly hath Committed it to some of the gravest and most experienced of their number to review such Processes (where Appeal or Complaints hath been made) and relieve them who are injured. And it is evident to all who know our practice and can judge of them without partiality, that the Presbyterian Church in Scotland hath at this juncture used all due means to make her Moderation known to all Men, believing that the Lord is at hand, who will judge between us and them who shew such *spight* against us; to whose judgments, and to the Censure of unbiassed Men, when they have heard both Parties; and notwithstanding our masters, we refer our Cause.

VINDICATION OF THE CHURCH of SCOTLAND;

an Answer to a Paper, Intituled, Some Questions concerning Episcopal and Presbyterial Government in Scotland; wherein the latter is vindicated from the Arguments and Calumnies of that Author; and the former is made appear to be a stranger in that Nation.

O apparently weak and inconsequential are the Reasonings of this Pamphleter, that nothing could make it reasonable for a Man who hath few spare hours from more necessary work, to undertake an Answer, except the Advice that the Wise man giveth Prov. 26. 5 for we find it to be the Genius of some of his Party, they find that Scripture and Reason cannot, and Authority will not, bear their tottering Cause, to betake themselves to clamorous lies and charging others, (as sometimes Children do) with the same in which themselves are most culpable; as in a late piece, intituled, *Account of the present Persecution of the Church of Scotland by the Presbyterians*. And to write (with or without reason, seemeth to be much the same with them) something that may prevail with their ease and byassed passions; for some men are more ashamed to say nothing, then to say nothing to purpose.

He beginneth in his Title page with some Testimonies of King James VI. against the Presbyterians. To which two things may be said: that King James, in an alter Edition of his *Basilikon Doron*, did declare that gone but such as *Anabaptists* and *Familists*. 2. We set in opposition this Assertion, another saying of the same Royal Author, mentioned below.

His preface taketh notice of two opposite Narratives concerning the Act restoring it 1662. the other to the Act by which it was abolished 1689. whether of these contain most Truth and Justice is not to be judged of, but by entering on the Merits of the Cause; this Pamphlet, with this Answer to it, may contribute some light

to it. But that he supposeth Episcopacy to be best fitted to keep our
 relie, is *gratis dictum*: and the falshood of it is manifest, if we ac-
 Popery to be Hereſie; the Abominations of which aroſe, and grew
 under that Government of the Church in this Nation; what might
 effects in other Churches, we do not now conſider. And our experi-
 may inform us what ſteps have been made, not only toward the Sup-
 tions, but even the Doctrines of Popery under its Wings, ſince its re-
 ration. And how Arminianiſm hath been warmed, and got life by its
 fluence in Scotland, is too well known. He cannot be ignorant of
 K. James VI. (whole Authority in matters of Truth, he often brings
 an Argument) uſed to ſay of Presbytery, as managed in Scotland, *The*
Errour could get footing there, while Kirk-Sessions, Presbyteries, Synods,
General Aſſemblies ſtood in their force. What evil ſpeaking and reviling
 is in the *Brief and True Account of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland*
 occaſioned by the Episcopalianſ ſince the Year 1660. I know not
 having ſeen that Book: But I am ſure his Party is in *mala fide* to chal-
 it, their ſtile being ſuch to the life, not in this Pamphlet only, but
 eſpecially in thoſe before mentioned.

§ 4. The firſt of his Questions is, *Whether Presbytery (as contrary*
Episcopacy reſtored in Scotland 1662.) was ſettled by Law, when the Pro-
Religion came to have the Legal Eſtabliſhment in that Kingdom? Which
 ſtion may be two ways underſtood, and neither of them much to his
 poſe: either, whether the Proteſtant Religion, when it was ſettled by
 found Presbytery already eſtabliſhed; which is a fooliſh Queſtion
 who ever heard of Presbytery under regnant Popery; we deny not
 copacy to be as old as Popery: or, whether Proteſtantiſm and Pres-
 bytery were by Law eſtabliſhed at the ſame inſtant: neither is this Queſtion
 the preſent purpoſe; for it is enough to ſhew the Opinion of the Church
 of Scotland (as ſoon as reformed) about Church Government, if our
 verſaries cannot make it appear that ſhe choſed to be governed by his
 And if we can ſhew that Presbytery was the Government practiſed
 from the beginning of the Reformation; and that it was by Law eſta-
 bliſhed; as ſoon as any fixed Government could be ſettled. And good
 ſons may be given why it was not done at the very firſt. *Firſt*, The
 and Idolatry of that way were ſo groſs, and of ſuch immediate hazard
 Souls of People, that it is no wonder that our Reformers minded the
 and mainly, and thought it a great ſtep to get theſe removed, ſo that
 took ſome more time to conſult about the reforming of the Govern-
 ment of the Church. *Secondly*, It was impoſſible at firſt, when the Nation was

except out of Popery, to get a competent Number of Ministers and
 ers, who might manage the Government of the Church; but this be-
 came to be a work of time: But what they did in this, and what was
 their Sentiments about Church Order, we shall after have occasion to
 enquire.

§ 5. Toward the Resolution of his first Question, he tells us, in seve-
 particulars, wherein all the dispute is, that is intrinsic to the Notion
 of Church Government; which his Question he stateth with no great shew
 of understanding in these Controversies. But that I insist not on, that which
 is chiefly to be observed is, that he overlooketh that which is the chief
 (the only) Question, on which our Controversie with the Prelatists
 turn; viz. Whether the Government of the Church should be in
 the hands of a single Person, or of a Community? whether the Rulers of
 the Church ought to manage that Work in parity, or One should manage
 the Supreme, and the Rest in subordination to him. The distorted notion
 of a Moderator in Church Meetings that he hath taken up, seemeth to mis-
 lead him in this matter; for we will not yield that the Moderator, *quasi talis*, is
 the Church Governour, nor that he hath any Jurisdiction over his Brethren;
 his power is meerly *ordinative*, not *decisive*; to be the mouth of the meet-
 ing, not to be their Will or commanding Faculty; to keep order in the
 meeting and managing what cometh before them; not to determine what is
 to be done among them. The Author talketh at random, not knowing what
 he saith, nor whereof he affirmeth, when he speaketh of our election of a
 Moderator, as done *by the Clergy* (as he speaketh) *Lay-Elders and Deacons*:
 where was it ever heard of that Deacons had a Vote in Presbyteries or
 Synods, among Scotch Presbyterians; we count them (though they are
 Ministers of Divine appointment, yet) the Servants of the Church, not
 Rulers; they are employed about her Goods, not in the Govern-

ment. He asserteth that the Protestant Religion was by Law established
 in 1567. and the Constitution of Bishops remained as the Legal estab-
 lishment, and that Presbytery was not Legally sealed till 1592. His proofs
 are weak, and Objections that he obviateth against it, I shall consider, after
 I have given a true Historical Account of the being and establishment of
 Presbytery in this Nation. Two things we maintain as to this; the former
 is, That not Episcopacy, but a Government managed by the Teachers
 of the Church acting in commune, and in parity, had place in the
 Church of Scotland with us first Christianity and some Ages after. The
 second is, That not Episcopacy, but Presbytery, was the Government

of the Church of *Scotland* as soon as it was reformed from Popery. For
 former, Though we assert not that the first Christians in *Scotiana* had
 bytery in all the Modes of it, as we have; neither can we attain the dis-
 Knowledge of the Actings of these Times by any Records that are left
 yet that there was a Parity, and no Prelacy among the Church Rulers
Scotland: For all agree that *Donald* (who entred upon the Governme-
 in the Year 199.) was the first Christian King in *Scotland*, though it is
 onally thought, by the best Historians, that Christianity was embrace
 many of the People before that: And *Baronius* affirmeth, That the Scot
 ceived the Christian Faith from Pope *Pistor*; (had he said in his time,
 should have assented fully, but what he saith is enough to our purpose)
 was Bishop of *Rome* from 194 to 203. And it is clear from *Baronius*,
 the current of Historians, that *Palladius* was the first Bishop of the S
 (*Spondan. Epit. Annal. Baron. ad Annum Christi 431. p. (mibi) 592.* hath
 words, *Sanctus Prosper missum aut Palladium ordinatum primum Episcopum*
Scotos.) He was sent thither by Pope *Celestine*, who ascended that Chair
 424. So that the *Scotch* Christians lived without Bishops for about 200
 until Popery and its Appendices did overspread the World. What
 ledged by some, that *Palladius* was sent to convert the *Scots*, is contra-
Beda, who tells us *lib. 1. cap. 13.* that he was sent *ad Scotos in Christianis*
dentis. And what others alledge, that he was sent to the *Irish* in *Ire*
 who then were called *Scots*, is without ground. For *Beda Hist. lib. 1.*
 sheweth whom he meaneth by *Scots*, to wit, those that were seperated
 the *Britains* by the two Seas, which he sheweth to be *Clyde* and
 2. *Patrick* was sent to them at the same time; viz. *Palladius* was se-
Scotland Anno 431. and *Celestine* died in the beginning of 132. who ye
Patrick to *Ireland*; and there is sufficient ground for this from *Balan*
 by Sir *G. McKenzie* against *St. Asaph* where it is said that *Palladius* wa-
 to *Scotland*; that *Clarus* Anno 434 and therefore could not die to
 room for *Patrick* in *Ireland* 431. and that he died at *Eordon* in the Mer
Scotland. Also *Tertullian*, who lived in the beginning of the Third
 tury, speaketh of the *Scots* as then Christians; & *Britannorum Romae*
accessit loco Christo vero subdita, which *Baronius* applieth to the *Scots*;
 to no other in that Use it can be applied. *Spanhem. Epis. Irag. ad*
N. T. Saecul. 3 Sect. 2. distinction hoc dicit esse Vulgatum.

Christi transactis tribus Annis atque ducentis
Scotia Catholicam capis habere fidem.

Besides this, it is clear from *Beda Hist. lib. 3. c. 25.* & *lib. 5. c. 16.*
 how averse the *Scots* were from the practices of the Romish Church

the Observation of *Easter* and the *Tonsure*. And that Venerable Author, maketh them as ignorant of the *Canons*; and that they knew nothing but the *Customs of the Apostles*: Which may give good ground to think, that it was long before that Church-Domination, *Prelacy*; which at last they were forced to submit to, got place among them.

§ 7. That *Bishops* were settled in *Scotland* with the beginning of Christianity, *Arch-Bishop Spotswood* doth boldly assert, but doth not bring any vouchers for what he affirmeth: Neither doth he name any one of these Bishops till *Amphibalus*, who (he saith) sat first Bishop in the *Isle Iona*, or *Colmkill*: But this was long after Christianity came into *Scotland*; to wit, at the time was now lapsed that the *Culdees* remained in the *Isle of Man*, where *Crathelmsh* (little less than a hundred Years after *Donald*, and the entrance of Christianity) built a Church for them called *Fannum Sodorensis*; that they were at least above a Hundred Years without a Bishop. Again, *Spotswood* is alone in this, all other Historians making *Palladius* the first Bishop. Neither is there any ground to think that *Amphibalus* was in any degree of Jurisdiction above other *Culdees*, but that he was a Famous Man, and the first of them that is expressed by Name in History. This Author telleth also of other Bishops, but giveth no ground to believe any more of them, than that there were Men so named, who were Famous among the *Scotch* Christians, and it is like were their Preachers. We conclude then that the Christian Church of *Scotland* was governed by the *Culdees*, who are sometimes called *Priests*, sometimes *Monks*, sometimes Bishops. Neither is there any ground to think that this Name was appropriated to any of them, secluding the rest, till *Palladius* came to *Scotland*; or less that any of them had Jurisdiction over the rest: What may be met with concerning any Famous Man that was Head over the Society at *Colmkill*, or elsewhere, maketh nothing for Episcopacy, for he was there the Head of a School, where Students were bred for the Ministry; or that he had Jurisdiction over the *Culdees*, who either there, or through the Country, Preached the Gospel to the People, hath no semblance of it. Yes, we farther assert, that however a Prelacy (together with other *Romish Innovations*) was brought into the *Scotch* Church with *Palladius*; yet Episcopacy, as our Pamphleteer pleadeth for it, and as it was lately in *Scotland*, was not known in this Church for a long time after. *Constantine* the Second King of *Scots*, in the Ninth Century, made Law against Church-men's meddling with Secular Business; so that they could not sit in Parliament: And it was *Malcolm* Canmore, in the Eleventh Century, who as he brought in new Titles of Honour into the

Civil State, so he changed the Discipline of the Church, and brought Episcopacy to its *anap*.

§ 8. The second thing that we above have asserted, is, That when the Reformed Religion was brought into *Scotiana*, and Popery cast out of it, this Protestant Church was not settled under Episcopal Government but under Presbytery, and did so continue for many years; till by the secret practices, and at last by open force of ambitious men, the Government was changed, to the great disquiet of the Nation. Although the knowledge of the Truth did begin privately to creep into *Scotland*, and spread among the People more early, even in the Reign of *K. James the Fifth*, and made greater advances under his Daughter *Queen Mary*; yet the first publick step of the Reformation that is found in History, was in 1540. when, in a Parliament, the rigour of Acts against them who have *English Bibles*, was taken off, and liberty was granted to read the Bible in their Mother-Tongue, also to read other Treatises: this was *An. 1542*. After this, for divers Years, many of the Nobility, Gentry, and Commons owned the true Religion, tho' the publick Profession was still Popish: Yea, by many of the Nobility and Gentry a Bond was solemnly entred into, for the defence of the Truth, and adherence to it, *An. 1557*. In the same Year the Queen granted Liberty for Publick Administration of the Word and Sacraments, as was desired by a Petition of the Protestants. *Anno 1559* the Protestant Ministers and People held a General Assembly at *St. Johnstoun*, saith *Knox, Hist. lib. 2. 137*: at which *J. Knox* was present. All this while there was no Episcopal Authority owned or submitted to among the Protestants; however Bishops still retained their places in the *Romish Church*, and in the State. In the Year 1560. *July 17*. in a Parliament held at *Edinburgh*, the Confession of Faith, containing the Heads of the Protestant Religion, was by Law established; *August 24*. an Act against saying of Mass. The same Year the Pope's Authority in *Scotland* was abolished by Act of Parliament. *Anno 1561*. The first Book of Discipline was presented to the Convention of Estates, but delayed and not approved nor condemned at the time; yet soon after it was approved by the Authority of the Council, and in it Presbyterian Government approved; for it owneth no fixed Officers in the Church, but Pastors, Teachers, Elders, and Deacons (what is to be thought of the Superintendents therein mentioned, is also to be considered) this Discipline, and the Book containing it, was subscribed to in *January 1561*. (*1560 stilo veteri*) by a great part of the Nobility: *December 1560*, a General Assembly was held, where for no Church

men but Ministers. Another General Assembly was held *December 25. 1562.* Where Bishops are so far from Church-Domination, that they and other Ministers, who had not entered by the Order in the Book of Discipline, are inhibited till farther Tryal. 1563. A General Assembly at *Perth* about the end of *June*, gave the same Power, or Commission, for planting Kirks, suspending, depriving, transplanting Ministers: &c. to some Ministers, that had been given to Superintendents: And it is noticed by the Historian, that Presbyteries were not yet constituted because of the scarcity of Ministers. What is there in all this that looketh like Episcopal Government? Another General Assembly met *June 1565. 25. of the same Year*; where the Power of Superintendents was a little clipped; also about the end of *June 1567.* At a Parliament held at *Edinburgh, Decemb. 15. 1567.* several Acts were made about Church Affairs, where not only mention is made of Synods and General Assemblies, but Appeals allowed to the latter, and from it Appeals are forbidden; and a Commission appointed to enquire into what points should belong to the Jurisdiction of the Church, and all Church-Jurisdiction forbidden but what is, or shall presently be established. Another General Assembly *Decemb. 25. 1567.* also *July 1568.* in both which Superintendents were censured; and a Bishop (to wit, who had been such) deposed from the Ministry. In the last Assembly it is appointed who shall vote in Assemblies, and not one word of Bishops. Another Assembly *July 1569.* Another *March 18. 1570.* where Order is set down about choosing the Moderator, there was no Prelate to pretend to that Privilege: Another in the beginning of *July 1570.* Another in the beginning of *March 1571.* where again Superintendents are limited. In *January 1572.* a Convention of Church men met at *Leith*, who were too much influenced by the Court: The Council also with the Regent appointed Articles to be drawn for the Policy of the Kirk, and after approved them: By them was restored the Image of Prelacy, (yet the real exercise of Presbytery, in all its Meetings, lesser and greater, continued and was allowed) for these called *Tulchan Bishops* were set up; who had the name of Bishops while Noblemen and others had the Revenue, and the Church had the Power. This cannot be pretended to be a restoring of Prelacy, more than Popish Abbacies and Priories, which were then the same way brought in. This Constitution was never allowed by the General Assembly, and lasted about three or four years, and as a Corruption was protested against by the General Assembly *6th. August 1572.* In an Assembly at *Edinburgh March 6. 1573.* *David Ferguson* was Moderator, tho' neither Bishop

nor Superintendent. Another Assembly *August 6.* Mr. *Alexander Arbuthnot*, Principal of the old Colledge of *Aberdeen*, was Moderator. Assembly *1574* concluded that the power of Bishops should be no more than that of Superintendents. In many of these Assemblies the Policy of the Church was revised and still carrying on toward perfection. After this, in other Assemblies pains were taken to perfect the Policy of the Church, which at last came forth in the Second Book of Policy, agreed on in the General Assembly *Octob. 25. 1577.* Also *1578.* at several Assemblies Acts were made against Bishops, the revising of the Book of Policy was delayed in a Parliament at *Sterling Castle 1578.* called the Imprisoned Parliament. General Assembly *July 13. at Dundie 1580.* condemned the Office of Bishops as unlawful; Another at *Edinburgh Octob. 20.* appointed a plan of form to be drawn for *Presbyteries.* *1581.* The second Confession of Faith was subscribed by the King and his Houshold: Where Episcopacy is condemned under the Name of Hierarchy, it being declared that no other Church policy was to be allowed save that which then was used, which every one knoweth was *Presbytery.* The same Year the Assembly caused Registrate the Book of Policy among their Acts. In *May 1581.* some Acts of Parliament were made, derogating from the Liberties of the Church, but so little weight was laid on them, that by the King's Command some Ministers were appointed to make Animadversions on them, to which the King answered, explaining and smoothing most of the grievous Acts. In the Assembly *1586.* Commissions for Visitations were taken from Bishops, Superintendents, and others, and the Church in several Meetings declared against Prelacy. Much Contention there was between the Church in her lesser and greater Assemblies, and a Court Faction, about Prelacy, which yet was never re-established; but at last the Parliament begun *29 of March 1592.* it was utterly abolished, and Presbyterian Government fully settled: which Arch-Bishop *Sposwood* in his History, tho' he cannot deny, yet doth most disingenuously labour to obscure.

§. 9, Let us now consider what grounds the Pamphleteer layes for his Conclusion, and what is the Conclusion he buildeth on them; the latter of these I first consider. In it I observe first, he is out in his Arithmetick for between *1567.* and *1592.* are not *35* but *25* Years. Another thing to be observed is, that it can make nothing for his Design, that Presbyterian Government was not presently established by Law with the Protestant Religion, because then the Nation having so lately been wholly Popish, and but few of the Clergy, or other Learned Men, converted to the True Religion, there could not be a competent number of Ministers got, who w

ably qualified, either to rule the Church or to administer other Ordinances: and the space of 25. years was not long for growing up of such an increase of useful Plants, as might furnish Churches and constitute Presbyteries every where in the Nation; especially if we consider what opposition was made to this settlement by the Court and its dependents; and how the unfaithful preachers complied with the Court, in hope of preferment from the year 1584. it was rather to be wondered at, that this work was speedily brought to such issue, and through such opposition. Let him take what advantage of his conclusion he can: it is evident from what hath been said, that Episcopacy never took place in the Protestant Church after the Reformation, till Presbytery was fully settled: also that the Inclinations of the Protestant People of Scotland (to speak in the dialect of our time) were always for Presbytery, and strongly against Prelacy: and that what the state did to retard this work, the Authority of the Church was altogether on the side of Presbytery. It is also evident, that Episcopal Jurisdiction over the Protestants was condemned by Law in that same Parliament, 1567. wherein the Protestant Religion was established: for it is a statute and ordain'd, that no other Jurisdiction Ecclesiastical be acknowledged within this Realm than that which is, and shall be within this same Kirk established presently, or which floweth therefrom, concerning preaching the Word, settling of Manners, administration of Sacraments. Now I hope none will affirm, that prelatical Jurisdiction then was, or was soon after established in the Protestant Church of Scotland.

§ 10. The Foundations on which he buildeth his Conclusion make as little against what we hold: he saith, the Constitution of Bishops, having then a Republick Authority, (the Popish Bishops sitting in this Parliament which settled the Reformation) must in the Construction of the Law be confess'd to remain firm 1567, to 1592; *Ans.* It is not denied, that the Constitution of Bishops, in regard of their Temporalities, (such as sitting in Parliament, &c.) remained after 1567. yea, neither do we say that that Law took from them the Authority they had over the Popish Church, (so far as then was in being) for this Law did not pretend to unbishop them, or make them no Priests; nor did it touch their pretended Indelible Character. But it is manifest, that after this Law they had no legal Title to rule the Protestant Church: and that by this, nor any other Law, no other Bishops were put in their room for the ruling of the Church. To what he saith of the Popish Bishops sitting in a reforming Parliament, I oppose what Leslie, Bishop of Ross a Papist hath, *De gest. Scotorum, lib. 10. pag. 536.* that *in eodem a secta nobilibus cum Regina habitum nullo ecclesiastico admisso, ubi* *sancti*

sancitum, ne quis quod ad religionem attinet, quicquam novi, moliretur: hac lege (inquit) omne sive hæreses, sive inimicitiarum, sive seditionis tanquam ex fonte fluxit. Another thing he alledgeth (or rather insinuates, in the 1st, Book of Policy, a *Superintendency*, (which is another Model of *Episcopacy*) was set up. *Ans.* It is true, the Protestant Church of Scotland in its infancy (it was neither by an Act of Parliament that it was brought in, nor that it was after cast out) did set up *Superintendents* but this was only truly (and was so declared to be) from the force of necessity, and designed only for that present exigency of the Church. Neither was it ever intended to be the lasting way of managing the Affairs of that Church. At that time it was hard, in a Province, to find two or three men qualified for any more work toward the Edifying of the Church, then reading Scripture to the people, and therefore they found it needful to appoint a qualified man in a Province, (and at first fewer, only five in all Scotland) who had Commission from the Church, to go up and down and preside to visit Churches, to plant and erect Churches: they Acted only as Delegates from the Church, and were accountable to every General Assembly where they were frequently censured: and ordinarily the first work in the Assemblies was to try their Administrations: as the number of Ministers grew, their power was lessened, and at last wholly taken away: the Commission was renewed often: other Commissioners also besides them were sometimes appointed with the same power. They were never designed to be instead of Bishops; for they did not keep to the old divisions of the Popish Diocesses. They might not stay above 20 dayes in one place in their Visitations: they must preach thrice a Week at least. In their particular Charge they must not remain above three or four Months, but abroad to Visitation again; they must be subject to the Censure of the Church, in her Provincial and General Assemblies. All this considered let any one Judge with what candor our Author calleth a *Superintendency*, a new Model of *Episcopacy*. It is evident from our Church History that the Protestant Church of Scotland was so far from that sentiment, that they had a strict eye over Superintendents, lest their power should have generated into a Lordly Prelacy: and that they laid aside the use of Commissions to Churchmen, and giving them such power, as soon as the Church could be provided with such number of Ministers as was needful.

QUESTION. II.

Having brought his first Question to so wise a Conclusion, he advanced to a second; which is.

Whether ever Presbytery was settled in the Church of Scotland, without consent from tumultuous times?

What advantage to the cause of Prelacy, or detriment to Presbytery is signified by this Question and the Answer of it, is not easie to divine. Is any thing bad that hath been done in tumultuous times? Doth not the Lord say *Daniel 9, 25. That he will build his House in troublous times?* Will this man therefore condemn the Reformation from Popery in Scotland to this, That it was settled against the will of the Queen, and the Popish Prelates, and some pretended, but unfaithfull, Protestants, in a very tumultuous time? It may be he will; and his Citation *Page 4 out of Basil. Lib. 2* seemeth to import no less: But if he thence conclude, That Presbytery is the Truth and Protestantism an Errour, we shall then know where to find him; And if he do not, all that he here saith is *extra oleas vagari*. It may be the strength of his ratiocination lieth in this, That Presbytery was settled by constraint; And these by whose Authority it was done, were by the tumults of the People forced to it. Let us a little examine

First, Is every thing bad that men are forced to? All men do few things willingly, and of their own proper motion: By his way of reasoning, the will and inclination of great men must be the standard of good and evil. 2^{dly}, presbyters had a twofold Settlement in Scotland: One by Church-authority: After searching the Scripture, the General Assemblies of this Church did find prelacy unwarranted there; And that it was contrary to that Form of Government that the Apostles settled in the Church of the ordinary Office-bearers of the House of God: And this they declared authoritatively in the Name of Jesus Christ: I hope he will not say, that this was done by constraint. Another Settlement it had by the Authority of King and Parliament, giving their Civil Sanction to it: Neither can he alledge, That the Parliament was any way constrained to this; Or that any force was put on them: Nothing appeareth but that the Parliament 1592. (which made this Settlement) was as free in the Election of Members, in their Consultations and Votings, as any that have been: And some will say, more free than these Parliaments which since have done what they did. It resteth then, That he must mean, that the Settlement was some way violented in that he assented to this Act contrary to his

his own sentiments and inclinations. But this resteth to be proved: beside, that it is a greater reflection upon the Conscientiousness and Uprightness of that Great and Wise Prince, than is decent for a dutiful Subject to be guilty of.

§ 2. Let us now hear how he will prove, first, That King James 1. 1592. Then, that King Charles, An. 1639. Assented to Presbyterian Government unwillingly and by constraint. His proofs are, *first*, King James in *Basil. Dor. L. 2. p. 28.* speaketh with great bitterness against the Presbyterians, and their Way. *Ans.* This doth indeed prove, that he had changed his thoughts of that Way: Not that he was never of another mind. It were not hard to cite words of his, as much to the commendation of Presbytery, as these in *Basil. Dor.* are against it. But that Way and its opposite, standeth or falleth, by the sentence of a higher Authority than that of men. *2ly.* He thinketh it against Reason and Charity, to think That this being his thought of Presbytery, he would settle it in the Church without some kind of compulsion. *Ans.* It is little more charity to think That a man of any degree of Conscience or Religion, would have so eminent a hand in plaguing the Church with that which he looked on as so pernicious, as the words cited by our Author do express: Yea, the fear of God would restrain one from such an act, even under the highest kind of compulsion. *3ly.* He next objecteth the Preamble to the Act for *Restoration of Episcopacy*, Anno 1606. *Ans.* Who can doubt, that when Men had a mind to set up that Government, they would say all the good of it that they could devise, and speak to the disadvantage of the contrary what could be thought upon; but this signifieth no more, than that they were changed from what once they were; and they who do so say and unsay, are unfit to give decisive Testimony about any point of Truth. *4ly.* He ascribes King James's assent to Presbytery to his Youth. *Ans.* He was no Child in 1592. having been married to Queen Ann three years before, viz. in 1589. He was at least 30 years of age. *5ly.* He pleadeth from the unquiet condition of his Affairs: but doth not shew wherein they were unsettled. It's true, the King then had some trouble with the *Earl of Bothwell*, but it is well known that *Bothwell* was no Presbyterian; and settling of Presbytery could not tend to quiet him: But I am weary of these silly Arguments which deserve no answer. What he maketh the King alledge, That the Presbyterians were always ready to joyn with any Faction in the State: is as groundless as any thing can be spoken: They never owned any but such as owned the interest of Christ, and his Truth. Their appearing against his Grand-mother and Mother, was only in

ance of Christ's Truth, which these two Queens did labour to extirpate. And what is said of *inordinate and popular Tumults*, reflecteth upon Protestantism, rather than on Presbytery. 'Tis a strange insinuation that he hath the end of the Paragraph, *pag. 4.* That that young King was forced to join with the Presbytery in the Church, that thereby he might bring off Presbyterians from joining with the Acts of their Kirk to unsettle his Throne. Here is Malice mixed with incoherent Imaginations: For nothing but Malice can make us think that Presbytery is an enemy to Monarchy: but what dirt he casteth us, of this kind, afterward shall, in its place, be wiped off. 'Tis also strange fancy, that if K. James lookt on Presbytery as capable by the Acts of their Kirk to unsettle his Throne, that he should put it in that capacity, by settling it by Law, with a design to secure the Throne: It is as if a man should let in the Thief at the door, that he might sleep the more securely in his house.

§ 3. What King Charles says for Prelacy (to which all know that he was a constant friend) is much more modest than what we heard before: And we deny not, but what countenance he gave to Presbytery, in condescendency to his People: Yet from the transactions of these times, we may confidently infer, That the Nation, both in its diffusive and its representative Body, the Parliament, was for Presbytery: and our Author says of the Tumults of these times, (which were sad, lamented by all good men) layeth more load on Prelacy: The Tyranny and Innovations of the Church-Rulers of which way did force the People either to see first the purity of Gospel-Ordinances taken from them, then their Religion destroyed by a Popish Faction (as of later years appeared more convincingly, when the designs of these men were more ripened) or stand in their own defence. So that what our Author gaineth by this passage is, that Episcopacy raised a Tumult, which ended in its ruin.

QUEST. III.

THE Scope of his third Question, and of the Resolution of it, can be no other but to render Presbyterians odious; not to disprove their Principles, nor to refute their Principles: It is.

Whether the Principles of Scottish Presbytery grant any Toleration to Dis-

Qui tuleris Græcos de seditione loquentes? His party are, above all men Papists, in *mala fide* to blame others in this matter. A

mong

among what party of men hath uniformity, and conformity to all the Canons of their Church, and that in things confessed by them to be indifferent (that is needless) been pressed with more severity, imposed by more unmerciful Laws, and urged by more inhumane and cruel execution than them? That there hath been excesses among Presbyterians in this, I deny not; but lament it: *Humanum est Labi*: Moderation is not an easy Lesson, nor so often practised, as it should be when men forget that the Lord is at hand: as the best are apt to do; when they are at ease. But the unbias'd men, who know, and have observed the way of the one, and the other party, while they alternatively had the ascendent, will say, that the little finger of the meanest Prelate, and his Underlings, was heavier than the loyns of the greatest Assembly of the Presbyterian Church; an impartial and true Account of the Sufferings in both Cases will evince Which on our part, I hope may be given in due time; But on theirs, Account is given as remote from truth and Candor, as any thing that ever came from the Press: which it is like ere long may be made evident. But we desire not to recriminate, though necessity is laid on us by their History of things: far less intend we to retalliate, though it should be in the power of our hand: But we leave our Cause to him that Judges righteously.

§ 2. It is well that our Adversary is so favourable to that Institution of Christ, The Government of his House by Presbyters without a Bishop. That we own, in that he doth not blame it generally, or in its most offensive notion; Not Presbytery as such, but as *Scottish*. Let the Opprobrium of Christ escape his lash, and we are the less solicitous what he saith against the *Scots* in their management of the Government of Christ's House. He knows that *Scotland* is but one, and a small part of the Reformed Church, in which that Government hath been, and is practised. If there be any blame then in the practises of former times, when Presbytery was ascendent, let it be imputed rather to the *præsumptum Scotorum ingenium* (in which they of the other party have far outgone ours) than to the ordinance of Christ. I mean that Government of his House that we own. But even *Scottish* Presbytery, or that Government as exercised in that particular Church, will be able to stand before his Arguments. Though hard for any thing, though never so good, to bear up against Lies and reproaches.

§ 3. He should have considered, That there may be other Disorders living among Presbyterians than Episcopal men: Wherein that he saith on this Head doth only relate to them: There may be

peculiar reason for their not bearing with them who own Prelacy: viz.
 because their Church Government doth necessarily overtop, bring into
 objection, and root out that Government of the Church which we own
 in Christ's Institution: It is against their principle to suffer Ministers and
 Elders to live beside them, who will adventure to govern any part of the
 Church without subordination to the Bishops: And whatever Indulgence
 hath been, in bypast years, given to Presbyterians, as we know it was de-
 signed for no advantage to us, [without judging the secrets of any bodies
 heart;] to we know, that not only it was not the act of our Church-men;
 but nothing was more grievous to them, and nothing they did more active-
 ly oppose. Notwithstanding, it is the principle and purpose of Presby-
 terians, not to exclude any of them from their religious Assemblies, nor
 from any of the Ordinances of God in them, for their principle about
 Church-Government, wherein they differ from us. And for Ministers
 among them, we are ready to give the right hand of fellowship, and to
 admit to all the parts of the exercise of their Function among us, such of
 them as shall not be made appear to be insufficient, scandalous, or erro-
 neous, or to be void of that holiness of life that becometh a Minister, and
 who shall be found willing to secure the Government of the Church that
 is now down, and to prosecute the ends of it; and not to exclude any simply
 on his opinion about Church-Government; though the mean while, we
 are not willing, that all who will profess to own our Church-way, should
 have a share in managing it with us; because many such might be a scandal
 to us, others might betray it; neither can we allow, that any of them
 should exercise a prelacy over us, or over the people of our charge. Far-
 ther, Never any Church or State, gave Toleration to Dissenters from
 the established Church-way, but as it might rationally be thought a ne-
 cessary relief to tender consciences: But this reason for suffering Episco-
 pacy men to practise their way among us, at this time, cannot, without the
 grossest impudence and hypocrisie be pretended. For refusing to receive
 the Ordinances from Presbyterians, because they want Episcopal Ordina-
 tion: this cannot be from conscience, seeing it was their constant practice,
 when Prelats ruled this Church: they never required any of them to be
 ordained who had been ordained by Presbyters, and after complied with
 Episcopacy: Neither can they pretend conscience for having a Worship
 different from ours (I mean the *English* Liturgy) for when it was in
 their power to use it, they never did. Wherefore there can be no pre-
 text on which they can plead for toleration in these things, but humor,
 design: and I hope it will not (by impartial beholders) be judged
 rigidly,

rigidity, if the State deny a liberty to such persons to make such Innovations as never yet could get place in this Church, especially when it is so apparent that they who are most forward for such a liberty, give ground to think, that a design against the present civil Government is at the bottom, they being such as have no liking to the present Establishment.

§ 4 But this Author hath a mind to represent us in other colours: And for a Foundation of this his Essay, he saith, *That the Solemn League and Covenant is the Canon, and the Acts of the General Assemblies, the Commerce of the Principles of Scottish Presbyteries.* This is false; the Rule that we Judge by in the Matter of Church-Government, as well as in other things, is the Word of God; and we use no other Comments for our help to understand that Rule, but such as are founded on the Word it self, and which we give sufficient Warrant for. I hope the Reader will look on this loose talk, as Railing, not Arguing. He may know, that Presbytery was long in Scotland before that Covenant had a being. And the Acts of General Assemblies, they are no farther our Rule, than the are agreeable to the Supreme Rule, The Word of God, and to the Principles of Right Reason: Neither do we look on them as Infallible, [as he too lightly feigneth, pag. 6.] What he, or any other can make appear in them to be unwarranted, we are ready to disown: And we know they may be changed by the same power that made them; when any thing in them shall be found to be amiss, or inconvenient for the present state of the Church.

§ 5, He quarrelleth with three Articles of the Covenant, viz. The first about preserving the Government and Discipline of the Church. The second that is against Episcopacy and its Dependents. The third for defending one another in their adherence to this Bond. Let any judge what is he inconsistent with a moderate and duly limited Toleration of Dissenters. Is there no Toleration of men who hold Prelacy to be lawful without allowing of Prelacy it self, and submitting to its domination. Next he improves his point from some Acts of General Assemblies; but this he proves first with the *peaceableness of the Prelatick Clergy in and after 1633* when their Church-Government was destroyed, in that they neither raised Tumults, nor wrote Books. It is true, they raised no Tumults; but they did what they could to raise War for continuing on the necks of the people that Yoke that they had wreathed on them: And did effectually draw on a bloody War, which had very sad effects, and issued in the ruine of the Church and Presbyterians too for a time, and shewed Will enough to raise Church Tumults, by their protesting and disobedience to the Sentence of the Church: for their not writing Books, who hindered them? Unhappy

men will impute it to somewhat else, rather than to their peaceableness. Another part of his Preface, That *they were not suffered to continue in their* *places*: This is indeed true of the Bishops as such: They were not permitted to exercise a Prelacy over their Brethren; for that was inconsistent with the Government then established: Yet as Ministers of the Church, none of them were deprived who were willing to preach under Presbytery. And for the rest of the Clergy, none of them were cast out for compliance with Prelacy, but they generally retained their places; wherefore this is a most untrue Allegation. A Third thing he saith is, That *the Presbyterians at the Revolution 1662. were not so dealt with*, that is, were continued in their places: Impudence it self could affirm nothing more. Were not above the third part of all the Ministers of Scotland [and in England] thrown out by one Act of Parliament? (For two thirds employed, and by that means kept their places) and the few (in Scotland) who could not be reached by that Act, were laid aside by the Bishops and Council, by more slow steps.

§ 6. The Acts of Assemblies that he citeth are, *Act Aug. 17. 1639. appointing all in Office in Church, and Schools, and all Members of this Kirk to subscribe the National Covenant.* And an *Act. 1642. for maintaining the said Act, and proceeding to Church-censure against them that refuse such subscription.* And an *Act 1644. appointing strict enquiry and censure against dissident persons to the Covenant.* And some other Severities he mentioneth only or falsely I know not, for he doth not direct where such Acts may be found) which may be acknowledged as no Pattern for after-ages to go by. As like if that Oath of God had been less universally, and less severely imposed, it had been better kept by many. What he alledgeth, That *Assemblies, Aug. 1642. do order the persons of them who are Excommunicated to be imprisoned, and their Goods to be confiscated*, is most false; neither any Assembly in this Church did make Laws for Civil Punishments. That I find to this purpose (for he is not pleased to be distinct in his Citations) is, that *August 3. 1642. the Assembly Petitioned the Council to the Laws in execution against Excommunicated Papists.* All this considered, I hope the Impartial Reader will not be imposed on, by what a man hath said, to think that the Principles of Presbyterians are inconsistent with what Toleration is due to Dissenters: Nor will blame them that they are not for a vast and boundless Toleration, nor because *they cannot bear them who are evil, but do try them who say they are Apostles, and find them liars, Rev. 22.*

QUEST. IV.

Whether from the Year 1662, to the Year 1689, Presbyterian Separatists were guilty of sinful Separation?

A Wise Question indeed: He supposeth them Separatists (which by the Author was ever accounted *vox media*, or taken in a good sense) and yet Querieth, whether they sinned in separating. But to let this pass; he telleth us of *Doctrines* taught in our larger Catechism, from which may be demonstrated, how necessary it is to Salvation, that every Person keep Communion with the particular Church established by the Laws of the State that he liveth in, unless she either enjoyn in her Canons any sinful term of Communion, propose in her Confession any Heretical Article, or prescribe in her Directory for Worship any Idolatrous Impurity. To this I reponde a few things. First, according to his loose and indistinct way of Writing, he neither telleth us what these Doctrines are, nor in what place of the Catechism they are to be found: we must take his Word for all this, and we utterly deny what he saith to be true. All that that Catechism saith, that could be imagined to have that tendency, is, That the visible Church hath the Privilege of being under God's special Care and Government, of being protected and preserved in all Ages notwithstanding the Opposition of Enemies; and of enjoying the Communion of Saints, the ordinary means of Salvation, she offers of Grace by Christ to the Members of it in the Ministry of the Gospel, testifying, that whosoever loveth in him shall be saved, and excluding none that will come unto him. Now it is evident, that all this is said of the Universal Church, not of any particular Church; far less can this passage be understood of a particular Church as established by the Laws of the State wherein it is: No Scripture ever made such Laws essential to the Notion of a true Church, from which none may separate: Neither did ever any Divine talk at this rate, except Episcopalians, and among them I remember of none, that express themselves, but this Man, and Dr. *Stillingfleet*. He doth indeed express three Cases, that excuse from sin in separating from a true Church; but how these can be drawn from the Larger Catechism, I understand not.

§. 2. How far we allow a Separation from the late Episcopal Church of Scotland, and maintain it not to be sinful in us, but sinfully caused in them, I shall declare: We affirm it to be no Schism, but a necessary consequence, that the Presbyterian Ministers did not own Episcopal Government, nor either directly or indirectly countenance the Authority of Bishops above Presbyters: He telleth us of a Letter for Union, March 1690.

therein it is said (and not answered) that never any Confession of Faith
 our Reformed Church ayowed a Divine Right for a parity among all
 Church-Officers. This Letter I never heard of before, but it seemeth
 the Author of it, and the Writer of this Pamphlet, have Talents equal for
 Controversial Scribbling: For whoever said that there is a Divine Right for
 parity among all Church-Officers? We know that by Divine Right Ruling
 Elders, also Deacons, are not equal in Church-power with preaching
 Presbyters. And for the parity of Ministers, if it be not found in any Con-
 fession of Faith, it's enough that it's found in the Scriptures. But we as-
 sume that the Divine Right of it is also found in the Confession of Faith,
 sworn to by the King and his Household, and by the Nation, wherein they
 assure the Hierarchy, or distinction of Degrees among Ministers. He
 that the Solemn League did not abjure the President-Bishop. Answer. We
 know no such Bishop, the President or Moderator hath no Jurisdiction
 over his Brethren. And he will not say, that the Bishops restored 1662,
 whom we could not yield subjection, was no more but a President-
 Bishop; if he do, all the Nation will cry shame on him, and his own
 tongue will condemn him. Page, 1, 2. of his Book, *What some in England*
maintained for, we are not concerned; if he had told us what concessions
 body or generality of Presbyterians in that Nation had made, also let
 us know where we might find such Concessions, an Answer might
 have been expected from us. But what he presumeth about the
 repentance of Scots Presbyterians for not submitting to Episcopacy as established
 in Scotland, is without ground, and absolutely false.

3. What we farther declare concerning the Separation that he speak-
 of, is, that Presbyterians generally did not think it unlawful to hear
 Ministers that had complied with Episcopacy; and often did occa-
 sionally hear them (whatever was the practice of some among us) yet the
 great part of the Ministers in Scotland, and to so great a number, and to whom
 the People were under a relation as their Pastors, being thrust from their
 charges for their faithfulness in that time of Tryal, and others being ob-
 liged on them, many of whom were very unqualified for the Ministry,
 they entering without the People's call or consent, they would not own
 them for their Pastors, nor thought themselves obliged to wait on their
 Ministry; but thought it their Duty rather to hear their own faithful
 Ministers (or others who walked in their steps) who were not unminis-
 tered by Church-Act, but only restrained by the force of a Civil Law, which
 neither derogate from their Ministerial Authority, nor lose the re-
 spective rights that the People had as the People of God; not, but some went be-
 yond

yond the limits of this Moderation; but that is not to be imputed to all the *Presbyterians*, being neither the conclusion of any Church-meeting among them, nor the sentiment of all.

§. 4. This being considered, taketh off the edge of all that he enlargeth on about the Episcopal party agreeing with us in the *Confession of Faith*, *Directory for Worship*, and *Administration of Sacraments*: For it is on none of these accounts that we withdraw from them; but partly because they suffer none to be Ministers among them, but such as comply with Episcopal Jurisdiction; partly because they deprived us of the Ministers that we stand in relation to, and ought to own; partly because the Ministers intruded on us are none of our choice (as they ought to be by the privilege that Christ hath given to his Church:). And indeed (many of them) unfit to be chosen; and partly because this change is made not by any Church Authority that we can own, but by the State, and by an unlawful Church power. It seemeth his Arguments are run low, when he charged us with *Nonconformity even to the Presbyterian Church*, in that we use not the *Doxology*, nor the words of the *Lord's Prayer*, nor the *Belief at Baptism*: For where or where were these enjoined by the *Presbyterian Church*? And if they have been, we cannot by such Injunctions be bound to what is after found to be inconvenient: That we are tied to the use of the *Doxology* by the *Covenant*, doth most ridiculously affirm: For whoever esteemed that a part of the reformation then engaged to? Using the *Lord's Prayer* we never condemned; but that Christ hath enjoined the using of these express words, that that Prayer was given as a form of words rather than a *Directory* for the matter of Prayer, we deny: Neither do we condemn the use of the *Creed*; but we think that they who have their Children *Baptized*, should profess their Faith so as may more clearly distinguish them from *Papists* and other *Hereticks* than that *Confession of Faith* can do.

QUEST V.

In this Question he advanceth a Paradox. The Question is. Whether the Penal Laws against Scotch *Presbyterians*, had any thing of the Execution in them?

This Question he concludeth Negatively, with the same brevity as *Adamsmberg*, and other *French Popish Writers* do affirm, That the *Protestants* who lately in *France* turned *Papists*, did turn voluntarily, without any compulsion; and that no Rigour nor Persecution hath been used to move them to this change: This is a degree

of bidding Defiance to Truth; and the God of it; of bold
 imposing on the Reason, yea, and the common Sense of Mankind; that
 the World doth purely owe to this Age, and to Jesuitical obfirmation of
 mind: But let us hear how he will prove this his strange assertion: As
 these Laws have beat out the Brains of many good Christians, that could
 not comply with them, so this Man thinketh by his Arguing to beat out of
 the Brains of such as remain, all Sense and Reason, whereby they may judge
 of what they hear, see, and feel. In clearing the state of his Question, he
 confesseth, *There may be too severe Laws, under which men may suffer for
 conscience sake;* (this will increase the wonder of intelligent, unbiassed
 men who know our Affairs, that such Laws are possible, and yet ours are
 innocent) but maketh the Question to be, *Whether our Laws were not ne-
 cessary for preserving true Religion and publick Peace, or whether they were
 the uncharitable effects of a peevish Resentment, inconsistent with good Nature and
 christianity.* Tho' even that cloak of smooth words will not hide the na-
 turals of the Bloody Laws that he pleaded for; nor could warrant a man
 that believeth Heaven or Hell, to plead for such cruel Execution of them
 as was among us: Yet this state of the Question is not the same with what
 the Title is proposed: For there hath been few Persecutions in the
 world for which necessity hath not been pretended, and that were given forth
 for preserving a false Religion, or for hindring publick Peace; or that
 the Actors in them would call *peevish and inconsistent with good Nature and
 christianity, or Moral Goodness.* And it is certain, that where publick Peace
 may be preserved without such severe Laws, the enacting of them is Per-
 secution; which was our case: for nothing caused the sad breaches of the
 peace that were in this Nation in 1666. and 1679. but the unsupportable
 hardships (tending to make *wise men mad*) that they who feared God lay
 under by the severity of these Laws, and the Barbarity used in executing
 them.

§. 2. To vindicate the Laws from all blame of Persecution, he giveth
 a lame, unjust, and disingenuous account of them. Wo to Posterity if
 they be abused with such false History; it is little Honesty to transmit
 such things, to after-ages; but it is the height of Impudence to publish
 them among such as were Eye-witnesses of them, and among whom the
 effects of them remain with grief and smarting to this day. I shall first
 examine the account that he giveth of these Laws, and then shew how de-
 ceptive it is, by supplying what he hath omitted. He telleth a Story
 of the endeavours of the Synod of Edinburgh to have Presbytery established;
 and who can blame them, especially seeing their Attempt was only an Ap-
 pli-

plication to a Person of Interest with His Majesty. He telleth us likewise of their sending a Clergy-man (whom he will not name) to the same great Man (who is also nameless) with a threatening Message, *That if they would not settle Presbytery they should have the People let loose upon them.* This story I never heard before, nor know I how to examine the truth of it; neither can I meet with any person that hath heard of it; and I have more than probable grounds to let it pass as a Forgery: And if it had been true, was this private surmise a sufficient ground for a Parliament to make such bloody Laws against so great a Body of People as the Dissenters? Men will think it a weak Cause that must be supported by such silly shifts. I take no notice of the Act annulling so many preceeding Parliaments and their Acts (tho' this were hard enough) nor of their Act of Restitution of Bishops; it is not the right or wrong of the Acts that we are now considering, but whether they were Moderate or Persecuting. But it is not far from ridiculous that he addeth, That *this Imperial Address from the Ministers* (a private Transaction between two Men, if it had any truth in it) *should so far influence* a Parliament, as to make them impute all the Evils that he fancieth had fallen out, to the Invasion made of Episcopal Government.

§. 3. He next giveth us account of the effect of settling Episcopacy. And first, in the non-compliance of some of the Ministers, and their being therefore deprived of their Churches and Benefices. And is this no Persecution? How then is it that the World is filled with such outcries in one Print after another, as if the Prelatick Clergy in Scotland were under sufferings beyond the French Dragooning, because some of them (and but a few of many that are guilty) are deprived by the State for refusing to own the Civil Government under which they live: A Crime never till this day thought consistent with the Being, much less with the Peace of any Government. But these Men have not learned Christ's Precepts, *To do to others as they would be done by themselves.* But this Act was not so much persecution against the Ministers that were laid aside (they suffered the loss of their Livelihood) as of the Church, and the People whose Souls smarted under a sad loss, considering how many Eminent and Holy Men were among them that were so *snatched* from their Flocks. And what a loss of Men were put in their room. If these Servants of God endured no Persecution from the State, I am sure they do from this Man's virulent Pen who saith, *They forsook their Ministry either because of disappointment of their hope of Preferment, or from love of Ease, and weariness of their Work, or from impatience to be hindered more.* The Law

will refute this malicious passage, when he shall come with ten thousands of
 Saints, to execute judgement upon all, And to convince all that are ungodly a-
 mong them, of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and
 of all the hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him, Jude v. 14.
 This man cannot be ignorant of what is known all Scotland over, with-
 out question or contradiction, that some of these Ministers had prefer-
 ment in their office, yea, the highest preferment in the Church, and re-
 fused it: that they did not consult their ease, but did most laboriously
 preach under the greatest hardships and hazards; which is to this day seen
 in its effects, on the crazy bodies of not a few of them: and if any did
 otherwise, it was very ill lookt on by the rest; and it is known they were ne-
 ver backward to be subject to Christ's appointments; tho' they cannot
 (for Conscience sake) stoop to those of Men, in the Matters of God.

§ 4. Then he telleth us of the compliance of other Ministers; but it
 is unaccountable which he maketh the motive of some of them, *that the E-*
pis copacy when tested, was not abjured in the Solemn League. Nothing but Ig-
 norance of that Oath, or Impudence to say what one will, could make
 them say so: it is known, that this was not pleaded by them, but either
 that that Oath was not binding, or that they had not taken it, and were
 not bound by the Nations taking of it: and if this were true, what should
 have stirred the zeal of that party so against that Oath, as to get it abjured,
 and burnt, in contempt, by the common Hangman. He telleth us next,
 how the people did comply, till 1662. It is true, hearing the conform
 Clergy was common at first, (other compliance was never given; but
 the entire dislike of Episcopacy was as extensive as any respect to Presby-
 terian Government was) but after a short tryal, many serious people, who
 minded the edification of their Souls, found what a sad change they had
 made, and what want there was of the godly, learned, and grave Men; that
 he speaketh of, to supply vacant places: which moved the people to look
 for better means of edification: I deny not but some run to an excess:
 but there was sufficient reason for leaving these Intruders, when others
 could be had. And both Ministers and People behaved to take some time
 to consider what was duty, and after they had been for a time stunned
 with the sad stroke that came upon them. He next giveth account of one
 of his Innocent Laws; It is, *For, 2. Parl. 1. Sess. 3. Act. 2. Ann 1663. All*
who come not to hear their Ordinaries, nor to pay a fourth part of their yearly Rent:
nor, that had an Land, a fourth part of their moveable Goods: a Burgeis,
a fourth part of his Moveables, and the privilege of his Burgeisship is forfeited. Is
there no persecution? to force people thus against the light of their consci-

ence, to sit under the Ministry of them they had no Pastoral relation to, and to desert them to whom they were so tied; to hear constantly from that taught *Arminianism*; some that railed against serious Religion: besides the horrid Immoralities of some of them, which made the Ordinances of Christ contemptible to the people: for this Law extended to hearing of such, as well as others. And was it no persecution to enjoin so severe Fines for such a crime, so as a few Sermons might reduce a man to absolute poverty? And did it favour of no persecution, in the Preface to this Act, to declare such abstinence from hearing, to be seditious when they that were so charged, were as quiet and peaceable as any in the Land? He would excuse the severity of this Act from the Sermons and Books of some, written to justify the Murder of Charles the First, and the Banishment of Charles the Second, and the Necessity of taking up Arms against the King, and laying out the sinfulness of compliance with the *Legislative Settlement of Church and State*. Ans. If some, whose Spirits were imbrued by what they suffered, especially who being banished into foreign Countreys, took more liberty than was fit, and spake or wrote (on some of those Heads) such things: is it reasonable, or can it be freed from spiteful persecution, to charge the whole party with these things, and treat them accordingly; when it could not be, nor was unknown to them, that most of these things were quite contrary to the sentiments and practices of the best, and far greatest part of Presbyterians? And we may with good ground affirm, That the spreading of such principles among the people, above what was at first, was caused by the severity that they suffered: and that these severities had not their rise from the Act. As for the Murder of King Charles the First, it is well known, that the Presbyterians in Scotland did declare against it, both in their religious and civil capacity.

§. 5 What he next bringeth, of the open Rebellion of the Western part of 1666 (known by the name of *Pentland-hills*) was purely the fruit of those horrid Barbarities that that people suffered from Military force, sackings their Houses, and destroying their Livelihood, treating their persons with the greatest Inhumanity, under which they groaned for several years, and had no shelter but in Mountains and Caves, nor were safe but in small companies as could make resistance: and yet what then was done, was the act of a few Presbyterians, and therefore could not warrant farther severity, nor could be chargeable on all: and on this or some other consideration it was, that they had an Indulgence granted for a time; but it was so contrived as could not answer the necessities of the people, the

being all confined to one corner, and the rest of the Nation left idle; which made it reasonable for some to use that liberty, that they might serve the Church; and others to refuse it, that they might be useful in other places where it was not allowed. What is alledged, of *assailing Ministers, robbing their Houses, wounding them, &c.* much of it is found to be meer forgery, to make that party odious, and to give a colour for farther severities; and what was done (if any thing) was without the knowledge, and with the greatest dislike of the Presbyterians in general: for, indeed, the severities of that time did provoke some to run into these principles and practices that ever since hath been uneasy to the people, and grievous to sober Presbyterians; some of whom have been as much in hazard from them, as the Prelatick Clergy have been; it is therefore strange, that such things should be pretended to justify the bloody wars that followed, and which reach even them that were *quiet in the Land.*

§ 6. He next cometh to the Act 1670. wherein the Preface brandeth *Meetings* (tho' they were only for Praying and Preaching) as *Seminaries of Rebellion* (tho' it is well known that Loyalty hath been many times preached in them, and no Sedition nor Rebellion was ever taught, except by persons above marked) and for a *House-Conventicle, the Minister is imprisoned, till he pay 175 l. sterling: and must engage to preach no more, or be bound to leave the Nation, without returning, unless by the King's leave; and were to pay, an Inheritour of Lands the fourth part of his Rent; a Servant the fourth part of a Year's Wage; a Farmer 40 s. sterling; a Cotter 20 s. If the meeting were in the Fields; (where yet Christ and his Disciples often preached, and that contrary to the Laws of Men) the Minister was punishable by death and confiscation of Goods; and every Hearer, the double of what is now mention'd.* It here be nothing of Persecution, that hearing a Sermon from one that Christ by his Church hath sent to preach, should be punished at such a rate; and that a few peaceable People, meeting in a corner of a Wilderness, for no other intent, and about no other work, but to hear the Gospel, should take away the Preacher's Life, and the Hearer's livelihood; if this, I say, be no Persecution, let the World judge. There might have been some shadow for such severity against meeting without a licence, (though even that was in some cases necessary but that was always allowed by the soberest and wisest) but when nothing appeared in men's words or behaviour, but that in peace and quietness they were seeking for the food of their Souls, such severity must either be called Persecution, or we have lost the very names of things, and must call Vice, Virtue, and Virtue, Vice.

§. 7. What he hath owned is sufficient to ruine his Conclusion that would prove by these Topics; to wit, That the *Penal Laws* of *Scotch Presbyterians* had no Persecution in them. But it doth further appear how absurd it is, if we consider what he hath wisely suppressed, as unable to speak out all the truth. Three things he suppresseth, 1. Some *Legis* Laws. 2. Some Acts of Council or Orders given forth by it, which exceeded all the Severity of the Laws. 3. Execution of these Laws and Orders, beyond what either of them could warrant. For the 1st, in an Act of Parliament, Aug. 13. 1670. it is declared, that if a Minister *Preach* Expound Scripture, or pray in a house where there be more Persons than the House contains, (it is not said, than the House can contain) so as *without doors*, (which might happen without the Ministers or People's knowledge, after the work is begun, or by the Malice of some who stand without doors on purpose to ensnare those within) it is declared to be a *Field-Conventicle*: and consequently the Minister is liable to death, if he doth his best, so far to conform to the Law as to shun that hazard, the People are liable to forfeit the double of what in reason they could expect. By the same Act, the Lives of them that so meet are exposed to the mercy of their most malicious Enemies: for not only a Reward is proposed to any who will (tho' without warrant and Order of Law) *seize* secure any at such a Meeting, but they are indemnified for any slaughter they shall commit in the apprehending and securing of them. Nothing but the restraining power of God hath preserved the Lives of many thousands, were so (by this Man's Innocent Laws) exposed to the will of an ungodly and merciless Crew. Afterward an Act was made, declaring, that not only *Field*, but *House-Conventicles*, should infer the pain of Death to the Minister, and that a *Field-Conventicle* should be death to all present, Ministers and Hearers, 1685. May. 8. It is by another Act, 1672. declared, that where-ever a Minister, not allowed by a Bishop, or licensed by the Court doth preach and expound Scripture, or pray in his own House, where more persons are present than Four, beside the Family, or in any Family that is not his, tho' none should be present but the Family, that it is a *Conventicle*. And comparing this with the above-mention'd Act, a Minister looseth his life by Law, if he pray in a Family where he happeneth to lodge a night out of his own House. Likewise, Anno. 1685, 1684. any who refuse to witness, is, to be an accuser of the Brethren, the Devil's work) about *House* Field Conventicles, or Church-Distorders, are to suffer as guilty of Crimes themselves; that is, to suffer death; and thus the Wife or Child either contribute to take away the Life of her Husband or Father, or

crown life. Also Act 8. of the same Year, it is declared Treason to
 the Covenant as Lawful, or Obligatory, though we had sworn it,
 may being questioned about the Obligation of it, beloved either to
 save themselves, or suffer death from the hands of Bloody Men. And
 Husbands who complied with the Laws (unless they were also
 by the Council to be Loyal which no man could expect unless he
 thoroughly Episcopal, to say no worse) must be fined for their
 non-compliance, which put Men on this sore *Dilemma*, either
 naturally to put force on his Wives Conscience (which may be he
 not Command) or be undone. Beside this (which is the second thing
 mentioned) it cannot be denied that the Privy-Council gave Order
 only to Officers of the Army, but to every private Souldier, empower-
 them when they met any Person on the High way, to examine them
 whether they were coming from or going to a Conventicle: And if they
 did not by Oath clear themselves, they were allowed to take from them
 their upper-Garment. Yes, afterward the Officers (I know not whether
 Souldiers had that Power) were warranted to kill whom ever they met
 who should refuse to give them satisfaction about abjuring the *Sac-*
Declarations. It is true, sober Men did not refuse to take that Ab-
 juration; but it was an unparallel'd Act, to commit the lives of Men to
 the hands of Souldiers, to kill at their pleasure Men living in Peace, and going about
 Lawful Employments, without proof of a Crime, or did courts of
 Law. *August 3, 1682.* Major Warrant in many Counties, and the Laird of
Warriston, a Captain of Horse in other Counties, are empowered to act
 as Justices (tho' the ordinary Sheriffs and their Deputies were executing
 the same) and to keep Justice Courts; so that the Lives and Fortunes of
 the People were at the mercy of these two Souldiers. *Sept. 9.* the Laird of *Chal-*
merston (a Souldier) is empowered to put the Laws in Execution against
 transgressors from the Church. A Commission for judging and executing
 the same even to death, is given to *Crawford of Ardmillan*, *Novemb. 9.*
 6 days the like to the E. of *Linlithgow*. I conclude with what is wis-
 domer by the Prince of *Orange* (now our Gracious Sovereign) in his
 Declaration for *Scotland*, about Imprisonments without cause alledged,
 obliging many to swear against themselves, imposing Arbitrary Fines, in-
 communings on the slenderest pretences, making Men incur the danger
 of Life and Fortune for most innocent converse with their Relations out-
 of which the Counsellors themselves were guilty, and beloved to
 be Pardons. By empowering Souldiers to act the greatest Barbarity
 towards living in quiet, hanging, drowning, or shooting, without any
 course

course of Law. The Third thing is, That the Execution did extend both the Laws and Orders of Council, Multitudes of Instances may (as I hope ere long will) be given of Men pistoled, or hanged in cold Blood the High-way, on the Fields about their Work, or drag'd out of their Houses, because they refused to declare their Opinion of the *Murder of Arch-Bishop of St Andrews*: Of the *Insurrection at Pentland and Bothwell Bridge*, or of the *Covenant*. It is true, it doth not reflect on the Law, but it sheweth what spirit they were of who made them, in that they employed such Men, and did not punish them for such Facts, but rather countenanced them.

§. 8. He cometh now to his Conclusion, to clear the Laws from Persecution: And here he addeth some Considerations that he taketh for Argumentative: As that *three Rebellions were raised in the space of 23 Years*. But if these Rebellions were the Effects, rather than the Causes of Severity (as indeed they were) then his Argument is inconcludent. For it was so with the former two I have observed before; for the third may be he is not ignorant how it was influenced by that unparalleled ridiculous (but that it was on a mournful Subject) Libel wyer'd against that Noble Earl that was the Head of that Insurrection, making him guilty of *Leesing-making*, and lyable to Death for what unhappy Men, and even some of his Enemies, judged to be below the least Crimes. He saith, *none ever suffered for mere Separation, but in Part*: is it not Persecution to be turned out of a Man's Livelihood, and to be a Beggar for worshipping God? He saith likewise, That *none suffered but such as came to Church to save their Money, notwithstanding of a pretended scruple of Conscience*. This is spoken at random; many suffered for Conventicles, who did not so comply; And I am bold to say I knoweth the contrary of what he here affirmeth. He will have his Conclusion to stand, *Unless we will derogate from the Authority of King and Parliament*. That is a mistake: We question the Justice of their Laws, their Authority to make Laws. We may say, *Nero and Domitian* Persecutors, without questioning whether they were Lawful Emperors.

QUEST. VI.

IT may be observed from this Author's Conduct in his Pamphlet what it is to be fleshed in bold averring of what all the World knoweth to be manifest untruths: Some by boldness and frequency in telling untruths have come at last to believe them as Truths; what else could make him propole this Question, and answer it Negatively?

whether the Episcopal Clergy in Scotland from the Year 1662. to the Year 1686. shewed any thing of the Spirit of Persecution against Presbyterians?

We affirm that they did: He denyeth it. To prove what we assert, we might bring a Volume of Historical Instances, which now to adduce, should swell this Paper to an unbecom- ing bigness, and would anticipate what it is like will be amply performed in the History of the late Times: A few things I hope will not be denied by any impartial Person that know- eth Scotch Affairs; and will be sufficient to evince what we hold in this: One is the Bishops of this Church sat in Parliament when the above-mentioned Laws were made; and any of them either Reason or Vote against any one of them? Yea, it is known that they were active Promoters of them; yea, our Author denyeth not their *consenting and advising to them*, tho' he will not own their *being the first Movers of them*. The former is enough to our purpose, and the latter is rationally suspected, both from the active influ- ence that some of them had in the Government, and from the spite that on all occasions they shewed against Men of our way. Another Evidence of this is, the Church-men in their publick Sermons did frequently inflame both the Magistrates and Souldiers to execute the Laws against Dissenters, and helped them by Direction, Intelligence and all the ways that they could; as thousands of Instances might make appear. A Note of a Sermon is much talked of, wherein the Judges of Assize, or Circuit-Court. (before whom it was preached) were advised to *dye their Scarlet Robes yet more red in the Blood of these Men*. Again, it is known that the Ministers were the Informers against such as did not comply with the Laws. It is true, this was enjoyned them by the Rulers: But conscientious Men would not have persecuted them that feared the Lord, at the Command of Men: whereas most of them gave ready, chearful, and forward Obedience to these Injunctions. He talketh of some of them *who did not, but were chid by the Judges*: And we confess, they were not all Persecutors but many, yea, the far greatest part were.

Q. Now what hath he to say for vindicating the Clergy from this Imputation? He tell- us, *The Clergy never Addressed the King for punishing the Presbyterians*. A goodly apology! as if there were no other way of compassing such a malicious Design. save this. Next, *The inferior Clergy did not obey the Order for Informing*. This is answered: they did, and but a few refused. He talketh of *Bishops shewing Acts of Charity, in relieving the Necessities of Presbyterians, and mitigating the penalties of the Law when it was in their power, and that the particulars of this might swell his Paper to a great bulk*. Answer. If Acts it seems were very secretly done; neither the man's own left Hand, nor the observation of others could discern them. If some Acts of Charity were done to some in- dividuals, it is no more than what some Oppressors have done, first made People poor, by taking a pound from them, and then relieved them by giving a penny: notwithstanding that they have given a Cup of cold Water to Sufferers, shall not want their Reward from the Lord, nor their Commendation from us, That *private and publick witnessing against Schism was all that the inferior Clergy did against Dissenters*, is so false an Assertion, nothing can be more false.

Q U E S T. VII.

whether the Episcopal Church of Scotland were Complicit with the Designs for taking away the Penal Law against the Papists

I will here vindicate his own Church from this blame, and in the next Question throw it on the Presbyterians; both of them with a like truth and candor. We are now charging all the Episcopal Party in this matter, especially the Church dissol- ved, who he saith *was represented in Parliament*. We know these Patriots did worthily in oppos- ing.

ing that ill and dangerous Design; but we will not own, that all that sat in that honourable Assembly were Episcopal; however, they went a farther length in complying with it than some have freedom to do. Not a few of them, we hope, will now shew, and have shewed, that that way was not their choice: for the Bishops, he seemeth not to deny, two of the fourteen were for it; and it is well known how far these two (and they were the two Heads, the Archbishops) appeared for it, both in Council, and Parliament: and that two were deprived, yea, and appeared against this design, we deny not; but can be say, that the rest appeared against it in Parliament, when they had the fairest opportunity, and were in a special manner called to it. For the inferior Clergy, he will have them all innocent in this matter, because they preached against the Doctrines of Popery; that they prayed for the Protestants in France: and other appearances they made against Popery. None of these things we deny; nor do we envy them their due praise on this account, yet two things are to be considered; one is, That it was but the practice of some. It is well known how many were sinfully and shamefully silent; and others, who were bold to speak, were checked by their Bishops for it. The other is, That it is very consistent to be against the Doctrines of Popery, and yet to be for a Toleration to them, and against their being under the hazard of Penal Laws for their Religion: Whence I infer, That his Conclusion doth not way follow from his Premises.

§ 2. The Zeal that some of the Prelatists shew'd for continuance of the Penal Laws, might be considered, either with respect to Papists, or to Protestant Dissenters, who might be ease by the removal of these Laws: the former Part of their Zeal was laudable; not the latter: which of them did preponderate, we are left to guess: and may be helped in this guess, by a common principle, that many of them (I say not all) have expressed; *That they had far rather that Popery should prevail than Presbytery*: and the actions of the dissenting men, and of the most part of them, do correspond with this principle, at this day. What are the sentiments of the Prelatists in Scotland, about taking off the Penal Laws against Papists, may be manifestly gathered, (unless we will abandon all argumentation and rational inference of one thing from another) if we consider what our Prelatical Parliaments have declared; what the Archbishops and Bishops in their Letter to K. James, Nov. 3. 1688. have with much flattery said, and what the University of St. Andrews, in the Address to that same King have published, partly of their adherence to him, while the conversion of our Laws and Religion was not secretly, but visibly carrying on; partly of the absolute, irresistible and despotick Power that they ascribe to him; for if he have the power to do what he will, and if he was for taking off the force of these Laws, (as he cannot once question) how is it consistent with that unlimited obedience that they owe such a Monarch, that they should not be also for removing them?

QUESTION VIII.

Whether the Scotch Presbyterians were compliers with the Design for taking away penal Laws against Papists?

HE affirmeth it: We deny it: But in this, that Scripture is fulfilled, *Psal. 55. 3. Thou hast iniquity upon me, and in wrath they hate me.* Nothing in this Book bears semblance of truth, and more evidence of spight than this. And in nothing the unfairness of his Party. and the integrity of the Presbyterians, did more appear, than in that was about taking off these Penal Laws: for his party had no inducement to removing them, except to please the King, and to advance Popery; but the Presbyterians

(especially the Ministers) were under the strongest temptations imaginable to shew themselves so inclined, not only to gain the favour of the Court, the want of which had been so heavy to them: but also because they were to share in the ease from heavy persecution, which these Laws had brought on them, and on them only; (for these Laws were severely executed against them, but not against the Papists) and above all this, every Presbyterian Minister in Scotland was liable to death by these Laws; none had observed them, and they might rationally expect, that the Court, being provoked by their appearing for their continuance, might cause them to be executed with rigour upon them; notwithstanding of all this, they took their lives in their hands, and as they had occasion shewed themselves against taking off the Penal Laws against Papists, meerly out of conscience, and out of zeal against Popery: whereas the other Party were not so faithful, as was above shewed. Their Reasonings against it on all occasions, and their dealing about it with Members of Parliament, are well known, besides more publick witnessing against it, as they had occasion. Neither can it be made appear (for any thing that I could ever learn) that any one Minister of our way was of another sentiment: and for others, two or three, or a very few instances of many thousands, is all that can be given.

§ 2. To prove his Conclusion, viz. That the Presbyterians were for taking away the Penal Laws against Papists, he bringeth two Arguments, which a man pretending to reason, might be ashamed to use: The first is. *They accepted, and gave thanks for the Indulgence, notwithstanding that they knew that all the designs of Court were for advancing of Popery.* *Ans.* They accepted an Indulgence for themselves, and gave thanks for that alone: which was their due by Christ's grant and which had injuriously been withheld from them: but that to the Papists, they were no farther concern'd in, than to lament it; which they did: and witness'd against it as they had occasion: For the designs of the Court, it was not their part to consider them farther, then to endeavour to disappoint them; which they did to the uttermost of their power, both by warning and principling the people against Popery: and also by doing what they could to keep the Laws standing in force against Papists. It had been a strange thing, if they should have been backward to preach and hear the Gospel, when a door was opened for it, because some men had a designe against the Gospel in their opening of it. Surely their silence and peevish refusing on that occasion had been much to the hurt of the Gospel, for then Papists (who would not fail to use the liberty, for their part) should have had the fairest occasion imaginable to mislead the people, without any to oppose them; on the contrary, their using of the liberty was the great mean by which (with the blessing of the Lord) so very few, during that time of liberty, were perverted to Popery in this Nation: and they that were so drawn away, were none of our party. We have cause to think, that if we had refused to use this liberty, this Man, and his Party, would have lashed us with their tongues for so doing, as they now do for the contrary: for they did so by some, who in former years refused to use a liberty granted; which we all know was designed for the same end. But we expect not that we shall be able to please them, whatever course we take.

§ 3. His second Argument is notoriously false, in all the parts and circumstances of it; and I affirm, that a man that knoweth our affairs shall not find one word of truth in all his long Paragraph that he hath p. 24. That they were silent against Popery in K. James's time, is grossly and notoriously false: it is true, some of them thought the best Antidote against liberty for Popery (and other sinful Ways) to be a sound work of grace in the Soul, and engaging people to be seriously religious, and therefore insisted mainly on such subjects: yet did not neglect to instruct people in the controverted points of our Religion, nor to hold forth the evil and danger of Popery in particular. For what he saith of the Reverend and Worthy

Dr. Hardy, who preached faithfully against a liberty for Popery, that his Brethren did blame him, or disowned him, is most false; they did often visit him in the Prison, which I had from his own Mouth; that Episcopal Advocates and Judges pleaded for him and acquitted him, was no more but what the one ought to do for their Hire, and the other were bound to by their Places: they acquitted an innocent man when no crime was proved against him.

QUEST. IX.

Whether Scottish Presbytery in the Church, be consistent with the Legal Monarchy in the Kingdom.

IF this Author knew us, he would not move this Question, and if he did not hate us, as we were not resolved to say all manner of evil against us, right or wrong, he would not (as he doth) resolve it in the Negative. We have no other proofs of the falshood of what he asserteth, but 1. Experience; which sheweth that in many Ages (in which Presbyterianism had place in this Kingdom, as hath been shewed above) it did well consist with the legal Monarchy of it. And 2. that he (nor none else) cannot shew what principle of Presbyterian Government, nor what practice of Presbyterians (that is common to them all, or generally) is inconsistent with Monarchical Government, as it hath been by Law owned in this Nation. We deny not but there have been some things acted by men of our Principles, in their Zeal for Religion, which we do resolve not to imitate; and that we can clear them from that degree of blame that the malice of their enemies casteth upon them, and particularly from being no friends to Monarchy, and unfaithful to their King: yet we hope the excesses that have been in former Ages, while both parties were overheated in their contentings, will be a mean to reach more Moderation to this and following Generations. Let us then hear what he hath to say for this his most absurd, malicious, and false Position. After I have told the Reader, that the only thing that can with any shew give ground to such an apprehension, is, that Presbyterians being generally the more conscientious party in the Nation, could not comply with the Lusts of some of their Rulers; nor subject the interest of Religion to their will, while others were ready to abandon Law, Religion, Reason, to please Men: who, in recompence of this, did exalt them above their Brethren.

§ 2. What he asserteth he offereth to prove, from the opposition of the Covenants of Acts of Parliaments, the latter giving to the King what the former taketh from him. The first thing that he bringeth as an instance of this is, That Par. 1. Ch. 2. Art. 2. it is the King's prerogative to chuse Officers of State, Councillors, Judges; but the Covenant maketh this prerogative of the Kirk. in that Art. 4. we swear to discover evil instruments, that they may be brought to Tryal; and confirmeth it, that Anno 1648. it is asserted by the Church, that the Duties between King and Subjects are the subject of Ministerial Doctrine, (for what he saith that the Kirk must be as infallible in this as at Rome; I pass it as the froath of a malicious man void of reason). A. 1. These passages were 20 or some few years before the Act of Parliament cited: how then can they be charged as taking from the King what he had not by these Acts for so many years after? But this is but a small escape in this learned Writer, Will any man of sense say, that the power of chusing Officers is taken from the King, because Subjects are obliged to discover and complain of ill men, or because Churches may tell Kings and Subjects their Duties? such reasonings are to be hissed at, not answered: Hath a man lost the priviledge of chusing his own servant, because his Son may

he hath hired a very bad man? Another Argument he bringeth is yet more dangerous to the King's prerogative to call Parliaments; but Scotch Presbyterians hold, that the calling of Assemblies, doth not flow immediately from the King, but from Christ. *Angulus, ergo Petrus stat*, is just as concludent: What affinity is there between the King's power of calling Parliaments, and the Churches having no power to call Assemblies for Religious Matters? We deny not power to the King even to call Church Assemblies; neither will we call any in contempt of the Magistrate; but we maintain, that the Church hath from Christ an intrinseck power to convene about his Matters. tho' the Magistrate should neglect to call them: but we confidently deny that the Church of Scotland ever (or thought it fit to be done) call an Assembly without the Authority of their King, where he was a friend to true Religion. Let him shew us what Magistrate called the Council is mentioned, Acts, 15. Another Argument he taketh from the King's power of dissolving Parliaments inconsistent with which, he saith, is the 2d Article of the Covenant, (he would have said the 3d Article) where we bind to maintain the privileges of Parliament; which is, the General Assembly, 1648, declareth against the Negative vote in Parliament. *Ans.* Could any other man have made such an inference, unless Presbyterians had declared that it is not in the King's power to dissolve a Parliament, but they may sit as long as they will: which never was said, nor imagined, for the General Assembly, 1648, denying the King a Negative Vote in Parliament: this doth not concern the sitting of the Parliament, but the validity of their decisions while they sit; also they say very little to this purpose, only in their Declarations, July, 31, they say, *that they see not how the privileges of Parliaments, and the King's Negative Vote can consist*. I wish this had been left to the cognizance of Politicians. But what the Assembly there says, was not their sentiment only, but the Parliaments both of England and Scotland at that time; so that his inference is no more against Scotch Presbytery, than if he had asserted the inconsistency of Parliaments in all Nations with the Legal Monarchy. That was a time when debates about Prerogative and privilege had issued in a bloody War, the result of which was the ruine of both: whereas now the Kings Prerogative and the privileges of Parliament being settled and acknowledged, and the King's Negative Vote owned by all, none do more cheerefully submit to the Legal Establishment in these things than the Presbyterians do.

1. He saith, *The Covenant depriveth the King of the power of making Laws, because Covenanters swear to continue in the Covenant all their dayes against all opposition*. A goodly consequence indeed: We swear not to obey sinful Laws; ergo, the King and Parliament may make no Laws at all. What he alledgeth in farther proof, *That the Assembly, July, 1648, declared against an Act of Parliament & Committee of Estates, dated in June the 12th Year, and in General against all others made in the Common Cause without consent of the Church*, is as little to the purpose: For it is not the same thing to declare the Laws of Christ condemning the sinful Laws of Men, and to affirm, that Men may make no Laws without Churches consent; neither will we plead for every thing that hath been Acted. Notwithstanding I hope Presbyterians will learn to give all due deference to the publick Acts of State, even when they cannot comply nor give obedience to them: He farther Argueth, *they deny to the King the Prerogative of making Leagues, and Conventions of the Subjects, which the Covenant was taken without the King*. This was no Act of Presbyterian Government, but an Act of the Estates of Scotland, of all Ranks; and this they thought to be necessary for securing of their Religion from Popish Adversaries, who designed to overturn it, and so it appeared, when the Design was more ripe, and it was fit to bring it more above board. He proveth also that Scotch Presbyterians are against this Prerogative of the King, *Acts, June, 3, 1642. The Assembly declareth against the Bond subscribed by the Scotch at Oxford, and in it is the highest Ecclesiastical Censures against them, and such as stand in it*. *Ans.* Sure he could not obtrude this on the belief of any, unless he had been

been confident that what he saith would never be examined : For in that Act of the Assembly there is nothing like condemning the King's calling his Subjects together ; but their condemning of a wicked Act that some of them (being but in a private capacity) did when they were together. For this Bond was not framed nor signed by any Parliament, or other Representative of the Nation, called by the King, but by a few Lords sojourning out of the Nation, who met and condemned what was done at home by the Representatives of the whole Nation. This Bond was sent to the Assembly by the Convention of Estates of the Nation, as the Act it self saith, that the Assembly might give their Opinion about it : and they declared the wickedness of it, and appointed Church-censures against the guilty : What is there in all this that is derogatory from the King's Prerogative of Convening Subjects ?

§. 4. His last Effort to prove the inconsistency of Monarchy and Presbytery is, That *Presbyterians deny the King's Prerogative of making Peace and War* : Which he proves because the Assembly, 1645. Feb. 12. declare them guilty of sin, and censurable, who *not contribute to carry on the War.* *Ans.* All that the Church did in this was, That solemn warning to all the People of all Ranks, for convincing them of sin, and pointing out their Duty to them, among other Duties, such as Repentance, Reformation, &c. They held it forth as a Duty for People to obey the Orders of the Estates of Parliament, ward their own Defence when a bloody Army of Barbarous *Irish men* was in the Bowels. If this his Argument can cast any blame on Presbyterians, 'tis this, that there are cases in which they allow the States and Body of the Nation to resist the King so far, as to hinder him to root out the Religion that is by Law established among them : And one may think that he might have been by this time convinced that this is not peculiar to Presbyterians, but that all the Protestants in *Britain* are engaged in the same thing. Nor can Papists reproach Protestants with it, for their Principles runneth yet higher.

QUEST. X.

H E hath said much to little purpose, he is now come to his last Effort, which doth evidently shew a fainting Cause, but strong and growing Confidence: For he saith,

Whether Scottish Presbytery be agreeable to the general Inclinations of that People?

This he denyeth ; we affirm it, and wish the matter could be put to the Poll among them that are sober, and that do any way concern themselves in Religion : We do not grudge them a multitude of debauched Persons, who hate Presbytery, as the Curse of Lusts, and love the other way, under which they might be as bad as they would, without a check ; tho' others could not be so good as they should without Persecution, or be discountenanced : tho' there want not a great many even of such that never liked Presbytery, tho' they could comply with it. Let us also set aside a sort of Men, who had their dependence on the Court, or on the Prelates, and could advance their Interests that way. We exclude also from this reckoning, the Popishly affected, who were but Protestants in Masquerade ; and tho' we deny not, that there may be found both among the Ministers of the People some sober and religious Persons, who are conscientiously for Prelacy, yet there are so few in *Scotland* (and were much fewer before 1662. since which time some have been bred to it) that not one of many hundreds or thousands is to be found ; and it has been in all Ages (out of Popery) seen, that so strong and universal is the inclination of the People against Prelacy, that it never was brought in but by force and fraud ; and that it had long peaceable possession in this Nation : So that it is well known, that not a few

in the Parliament, who have no Zeal for Presbytery it self, yet are for its being settled as, knowing that no other Church Government can suit the Genius of this People.

1. The Proofs that our Author bringeth for his Assertion are strangely inconsequent. he will not say, That the inclinations of the Nation Representative is for Prelacy, lest he found guilty of *Leefing making*, a Crime that he often talketh of, and it seems hath studied, and may be sometime strained his Wit about; but he will prove it of the *diffusive of the people*, and first, of the Nobility, because Presbytery is against Monarchy, and they own it. This is answered. 2. Because they have taken the Test and Declaration. Ans. He confesseth some Peers took neither; and they that did take them, did so by that shew their inclination so much, as what they thought fit to comply with, rather than suffer; how many of these, now when there is no force on them, shew that it was not choice, but necessity that led them that way; and many who seem to make Conscience of these Bonds, yet shew no inclination to the thing that they are bound to, except by the constraint that they have brought themselves under. The Gentry he will also have inclined to Prelacy, because they have taken the Test, which is answered: and because many of them, when liberty was granted, went not to Meeting-houses. A silly Argument, many did go, and most other clave to the former way, because the Law stood for it, the Meetings seemed to be of uncertain continuance, but how few of them now refuse to hear the Presbyterians? The Test is still the Argument, the Burgesses must be Episcopal, because many of them took it. Also, because of the rivers of tears shed at the Farewel Sermons to their Episcopal Ministers. O horrid Impudence! Scotland knoweth that where one was desired, multitudes rejoiced, others carried indifferently, at the removal of the few of the one who as yet have been laid aside; for the Clergy, we yield him all the gang, except those, and those of the more sober of them, who declare, that they never liked Prelacy was established, tho' they thought it Lawful to Preach under it. The ability and industry of the Presbyterian Ministers he laboureth to ridicule, but from such Topicks as are to be despised than answered. Our three Commissioners sent to London Anno 1689. (the former three he thinketh not worthy of his notice) he maketh to be the Standard of Presbyterian abilities: they are able to abide his censure, and to compete with most of his; but he might know, that among us many are infirm thro' Age and long Hardships, some of eminent Abilities; others are fixed in such Charges, where their labour could be wanted for so long a time: and what he objecteth against them who were sent so weight; the first, that he once complied is most false: he resisted great Temptations to such compliance, and bare faithful Testimony against it. The second suffered by his Principles in the time of a sad Division in the Church. The third is no obscure Person, tho' unknown to this Pamphleteer, from whom, when things went as he wished, good might be hid themselves, as from a Persecutor. We can also yield to him the Universities and the College of Justice, as lately stated; seeing none had access to such places but they who were Episcopal: For the Physicians, there are not a few worthy Men of that Faculty, who are far from inclinations toward Prelacy. It is a new Topick, nor often used before, That a way of Religion is the best, because most of the Physicians and Lawyers are of it: This Discourse will equally prove that Popery is preferable to Protestantism; for in France, Italy, Spain, &c. not the multitude only, but all the Church-men, the Universities, the Physicians and Lawyers are of that way. I conclude this our Debate about the Inclinations of the people of this Nation to Presbytery, with an Observation made by the King James, when Duke of York; and in Scotland; hearing of divers persons of Quality, who on their Death-bed called for the Assistance of Presbyterian Ministers, and related others, though they had in their life been either regardless of such Ministers, or persecutors of them, he said, That the Scots, in whatever Religion they lived, yet generally loved Presbyterians.